

File
IHC
Bills

ODP # 9-1561

25 October 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, NFAC Plans & Programs Staff

FROM : H. C. Eisenbeiss
Director of Central Reference

SUBJECT : RMS/IRO Issue Paper on Cross Program ADP

1. The RMS/IRO issue paper on whether funds should be included in the FY 1981 NFIP budget request for a Community-wide Bibliographic and Document Storage and Retrieval System is premature and hastily prepared and overlooks other resource implications to CIA components.

2. In a final review of the original CIA proposal, the DDCI insisted that specific funding language be forwarded to IHC stating that any increased utilization of the CIA RECON/ADSTAR systems by the Community would be on a cost reimbursable basis. IHC accepted the CIA proposal and forwarded it to a joint government/contractor working group. The working group was charged with evaluating the proposal and reporting back to the IHC with recommendations for action. IHC members have not seen the working group report. Given the resources involved and the implications to CIA in-house retrieval systems, the IHC and its CIA member should be allowed sufficient time to evaluate the working group's recommendations.

3. The issue paper identified four alternatives. Alternatives one and three should be rejected. Alternative one, which is the most costly, ignores CIA's space problems, security considerations, the manpower impact on CIA and the proposed direct cost to the users based on service utilization. Alternative three, recommending inclusion of a Community system in SAFE planning, is completely unacceptable. SAFE is a joint CIA/DIA system to support the production analyst. Any introduction of a major new requirement such as this could jeopardize the whole project which is overdue and urgently needed to improve the quality of production. If we expect the contractor to meet his schedule, we cannot add a Community system requirement at this time.

SUBJECT: RMS/IRO Issue Paper on Cross Program ADP

4. Of the remaining two alternatives, we recommend alternative four. Given the time devoted since January when the CIA proposal was forwarded to the IHC, it is precipitous to force a quick decision without completion of the evaluation study and sufficient time for each IHC member to study it. Much more thorough planning and analysis is needed before any major funding can be programmed. Alternative two is similar to an option in the original CIA proposal, but at this time is premature since no IHC member has concluded that the systems will be of sufficient value on a cost reimbursable basis. The alternative, moreover, does not include any of the CIA manpower costs required to provide service to the Community. Community utilization of the existing RECON data base will require manpower resources. Unless these resources are added to the alternative, it also must be rejected. It would be difficult to determine resources until IHC members have stated their service and input requirements.

H. C. Eisenbeiss

Distribution:

Orig. & 1 - Addressee
1 - D/ODP ✓
1 - C/DSG
1 - C/ISG
1 - C/SAS
2 - File